

Notice of Allowability	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/007,358	ORTEGA ET AL.	
	Examiner Ting Zhou	Art Unit 2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☒ This communication is responsive to 11/22/2006.
2. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are 10-24.
3. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of the:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* Certified copies not received: _____.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.

THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.

4. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
5. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
 - (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached
 - 1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date _____.
 - (b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date _____.

Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).
6. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statements (PTO/SB/08),
Paper No./Mail Date _____ 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit
of Biological Material | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413),
Paper No./Mail Date _____ 7. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Amendment/Comment 8. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance 9. <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |
|---|--|

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed on 11/22/2006 under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 10/007,358 is acceptable and a RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.

2. The amendments filed on 11/22/2006, submitted with the filing of the RCE have been received and entered. The applicant has cancelled claims 1-9 and added new claims 10-24. Claims 10-24 as amended are pending in the application.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 10-24 are allowed.

4. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: The present invention is directed towards generating glyph instructions for a person to follow in performing a process, regardless of the person's language, thereby reducing language-related misunderstandings of instructions. Each of the independent claims identifies the distinct feature of ordering a plurality of selected glyphs based on a type designation in order to generate an instruction for the person performing a process; each of the selected glyphs corresponding to one of an action glyph, a material glyph and an instrumentation glyph, and wherein the glyphs are not specific to any particular written language, and wherein each of the selected glyphs includes a visibly discernable feature identifying the corresponding type designation of the selected glyph, i.e. such that the action glyph is not the material or instrumentation glyph, the material glyph is not

the instrumentation or action glyph, and the instrumentation glyph is not the action or material glyph. The closest prior art, Pine Harbor in the article "How to Build a Shed" (hereinafter "Harbor") and Ballard U.S. Patent 6,321,243 teach the creation of an instruction for performing a process using glyph images. In the case of the Harbor reference, Harbor teaches a plurality of action glyphs representing a plurality of defined actions which are able to be undertaken by the person following the instructions (plurality of images representing steps to be undertaken in order to perform a process such as building a shed; the images include actions that are to be taken such as nailing, shown on page 5); a plurality of material glyph images representing a plurality of defined materials which are includable in the created instruction (plurality of images representing steps to be undertaken in order to perform a process such as building a shed; the images include materials such as wood, as shown on pages 4-5); a plurality of instrumentation glyphs representing a plurality of instruments which are includable in the created instructions (plurality of images representing steps to be undertaken in order to perform a process such as building a shed; the images include instrumentations, i.e. tools such as a screwdriver, as shown on pages 5); a glyph instruction generating system having an electronic storage element which stores electronic images of the action glyphs, the material glyphs and the instrumentation glyphs (the images are displayed on and by the computer) and an output device which outputs hardcopy images of the selected glyphs in relationship to each other in accordance with a predetermined structure to represent the inputted instructions (the images are displayed on the computer screen in a sequence in order to illustrate instructions for performing the process of building a shed, as shown on pages 1-2). In the case of the Ballard reference, Ballard teaches a glyph instruction generating system comprising an electronic storage element (Ballard: column 4, lines 51-53 and

Art Unit: 2173

column 5, lines 6-9), input device by which users selects a language and enters instructions in the selected language (the users enter characters in a certain language that are to be converted into glyph images) (Ballard: column 5, lines 9-14), a translator configured to receive the inputted instructions and to interpret the inputted instructions so as to select the glyphs which represent the inputted instructions (convert the inputted instructions, or text to glyphs) (Ballard: column 1, lines 26-33, column 3, lines 35-41 and column 7, lines 19-23), and an output device for displaying the selected glyphs (Ballard: column 5, lines 18-22). However, the prior art fails to teach that each of the ordered selected glyphs in the created instruction includes a visibly discernable feature identifying the corresponding type designation of the selected glyph, i.e. such that the action glyph is not the material or instrumentation glyph, the material glyph is not the instrumentation or action glyph, and the instrumentation glyph is not the action or material glyph; in other words, the prior art fails to teach that each of the generated glyphs can be interpreted to be of only one specific type (action, material or instrumentation), and cannot be interpreted as one of the remaining types. Thus, the prior art fails to anticipate or render obvious the above limitations.

5. Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2173

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ting Zhou whose telephone number is (571) 272-4058. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached at (571) 272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TZ



Kieu D. Vu
Primary Examiner